

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/764,385	EMBREE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Theresa T. Snider	1744	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** pending

 (1) Theresa T. Snider.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

 (2) Gregg Jansen.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 29 December 2004
**Time:** \_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

N/A

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner called Mr. Jansen to inform him that the declaration of 1/23/2004 is defective because it does not list a specific error of which the reissue is based upon. Mr. Jansen agreed to fax in a new declaration to correct the problem. Examiner inquired as to whether the court in the litigation case rendered a decision regarding the patentability of the original claims. Mr. Jansen confirmed that no decision was issued on the patentability of the original claims .